DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 046 TM 009 935

AUTHOR Enger, John M.: Sales, M. Vance
TITLE School Services Needs Assessment of the Basic Service Area of Arkansas State University.
PUB DATE Oct 77
NOTE 37p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Services: *Consultation Programs: Credit Courses: *Educational Needs: Elementary Secondary Education: Evaluation Needs: Higher Education: Inservice Programs: *Needs Assessment: *School Districts: *School Services: State Surveys; Teacher Workshops: Technical Reports
IDENTIFIERS Arkansas: Arkansas State University

ABSTRACT

Primary objectives of this study were: (1) to assess the perceived needs for outside services at 121 school districts in the Arkansas State University (ASU) service area: and (2) to determine the preferred types of outside services. Each school district was categorized by four factors: accreditation status, student enrollment, geographic region, and distance from the ASU campus. Twenty types of services were delineated, and ranked in order of perceived need: evaluation of instruction: needs assessment and evaluation procedures; design and evaluation of federal programs, including grant writing: school law: special education diagnosis and implementation: attitude adjustment techniques: student career awareness: school-community public relations techniques: curriculum design: classroom management: orientation for new school board members: facilities planning: assessment and improvement of school rating: personnel management: business management: achievement testing: extracurricular activities implementation: instructional materials: course scheduling: and transportation. Of the types of services desired, workshop activities and consultants were preferred over formal courses. None of the four factors used to characterize the school districts was determined to influence the needs for outside services or the types of services desired. (The questionnaire is appended.) (MH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED181046

SCHOOL SERVICES NEEDS ASSESSMENT OF THE BASIC SERVICE AREA OF ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

by

John M. Enger
M. Vance Sales

Division of Educational Administration
and Secondary Education

Arkansas State University

Jonesboro, Arkansas

TM009 935

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John M. Enger
M. Vance Sales

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

October, 1977

Introduction

No formal assessment of needs for outside services has been conducted in recent years of school districts located in eastern and northeastern Arkansas. In instances where needs may exist, school districts often do not employ the personnel to delineate and implement procedures for their resolution. With little apparent communication with Arkansas State University on the topic, outside service needs may exist in the areas where the University could coordinate resources to aid school districts as a part of its public service mission.

Purpose of the Study

The primary objectives of this study were (1) to assess the perceived needs for outside services in selected topic areas throughout school districts in the Arkansas State University service area and (2) to determine the preferred types of outside services to meet these needs.

Secondary objectives concerned the categorization of school districts in the service area by school classification, number of students enrolled, region represented, and distance from the Arkansas State University campus in Jonesboro. The statistical hypotheses tested were that no significant differences exist between groups on the various factors (1) on the apparent needs for outside services and (2) on the selection of desired types of outside services to meet these needs.

Arkansas State University Service Area

For this investigation the basic Arkansas State University service area was defined to include the 121 school districts in 22 counties in eastern and northeastern Arkansas as shown in Figure 1. These counties supply the majority of the students attending the University; Arkansas State University graduates also hold many of the administrative, teaching, and certified service personnel positions in school districts throughout this area.

Most of the school districts in the Arkansas State University service area are small by national standards (i.e., student enrollment less than 2000). Note Table 1, p. 4, showing 110 of the 121 school districts (91 percent) having less than 2000 students. School size is cross tabulated with the school classification in Table 1. It might be noted that the small school districts, especially those with less than 1000 students, in general, do not have North Central Association (NCA) accreditation.

Each of the 121 school districts in the service area is identified in Table 2, p. 5. The classification, number of students enrolled, and location by county are given for each district. A total of 114, 643 students are enrolled in these districts. From Table 3, p. 9, a total of 6,966.31 certified school personnel positions are represented in the 121 school districts.

FIGURE 1

THE BASIC ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY SERVICE AREA DIVIDED INTO SIX REGIONS FOR THE SCHOOL SERVICES NEEDS ASSESSMENT

TABLE 1

SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN THE ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY SERVICE AREA:
SCHOOL CLASSIFICATION BY NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED

Classification	Number of Students Enrolled					Total
	0-499	500-999	1000-1499	1500-1999	2000+	No.(Pct.)
NCA	1	13	14	9	11	48 (39.7)
A	37	17	1			55 (45.5)
B	12	2				14 (11.6)
C or O	4					4 (3.3)
TOTAL No.	54	32	15	9	11	
Pct.	(44.6)	(26.4)	(12.4)	(7.4)	(9.1)	121

TABLE 2

INDENTIFCATION OF THE 121 SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN THE 22 COUNTY BASIC SERVICE AREA OF ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

County	Service Region	Distance Factor	School District	Classification	Size	Questionnaire Received
Baxter	IV	Yes				
			Big Flat	B	147	Yes
			Cotter	B	437	Yes
			Mountain Home	NCA	2325	Yes
			Norfork	A	353	Yes
Clay	II	No				
			Corning	NCA	1401	Yes
			Greenway	B	210	Yes
			Knobel	A	378	Yes
			Piggott	NCA	1097	Yes
			Rector	A	738	Yes
Craighead	I	No				
			Bay	A	692	Yes
			Brookland	A	599	Yes
			Caraway	A	450	Yes
			Dixie	O	142	Yes
			Jonesboro	NCA	4595	Yes
			Lake City	A	451	Yes
			Monette	NCA	549	Yes
			Nettleton	NCA	1467	Yes
			Valley View	A	624	No
			Westside	NCA	1178	Yes
Crittenden	III	No				
			Crawfordsville	NCA	800	Yes
			Earle	NCA	1302	Yes
			Marion	NCA	1915	Yes
			Turrell	NCA	786	Yes
			West Memphis	NCA	6162	Yes
Cross	III	No				
			Cross County	NCA	1006	Yes
			Parkin	NCA	964	Yes
			Wynne	NCA	2833	Yes
Fulton	IV	Yes				
			Mammoth Spring	A	473	Yes
			Salem	A	702	Yes
			Viola	A	412	Yes

TABLE 2
(continued)

County	Service Region	Distance Factor	School District	Classification	Size	Questionnaire Received
Greene	II	No				
			Delaplaine	A	351	Yes
			Greene County	NCA	1791	Yes
			Lafe	B	233	Yes
			Marmaduke	A	544	Yes
			Oak Grove	A	702	Yes
			Paragould	NCA	1540	Yes
			Stanford	A	260	Yes
Independence	V	Yes				
			Batesville	NCA	1823	Yes
			Cord-Charlotte	B	231	Yes
			Cushman	A	254	Yes
			Desha	A	263	Yes
			Floral	B	183	Yes
			Newark	A	260	Yes
			Oil Trough	A	319	Yes
			Pleasant Plains	A	351	Yes
			Southside	A	625	Yes
			Sulphur Rock	B	163	Yes
Izard	IV	Yes				
			Calico Rock	A	459	Yes
			Melbourne	A	447	Yes
			Mt. Pleasant	B	260	Yes
			Violet Hill	B	302	Yes
			Oxford	C	152	No
Jackson	V	Yes				
			Beedeville	O	204	Yes
			Grubbs	A	349	Yes
			Newport	NCA	2530	Yes
			Swifton	A	287	Yes
			Tuckerman	A	743	Yes
Lawrence	II	No				
			Black Rock	A	367	Yes
			Clover Bend	A	113	Yes
			Hoxie	NCA	887	Yes
			Lynn	A	233	Yes
			Sloan-Hendirx	A	458	Yes
			Strawberry	A	244	Yes
			Walnut Ridge	NCA	1163	Yes

TABLE 2
(continued)

County	Service Region	Distance Factor	School District	Classification	Size	Questionnaire Received
Lee	VI	Yes				
			Marianna	NCA	3975	Yes
Mississippi	I	No				
			Armorel	A	241	Yes
			Blytheville	NCA	4469	Yes
			Dell	A	383	Yes
			Gosnell	NCA	1459	Yes
			Leachville	NCA	588	Yes
			Luxora	NCA	672	Yes
			Manila	NCA	856	Yes
			Mississippi County	A	238	Yes
			Osceola	NCA	2020	Yes
			South Mississippi County	NCA	1922	Yes
Monroe	VI	Yes				
			Brinkley	NCA	1811	Yes
			Clarendon	NCA	876	Yes
			Holly Grove	NCA	751	Yes
Phillips	VI	Yes				
			Barton	A	777	Yes
			Elaine	A	900	Yes
			Helena-West Helena	NCA	5069	No
			Lake View	B	382	Yes
			Marvell	A	1433	Yes
Poinsett	I	No				
			Harrisburg-Central	B	209	Yes
			Harrisburg	NCA	1108	Yes
			Lepanto	NCA	647	Yes
			Marked Tree	NCA	1140	Yes
			Trumann	NCA	1861	Yes
			Tyronza	A	286	Yes
			Weiner	NCA	529	Yes
Randolph	II	No				
			Biggers-Reyno	A	287	Yes
			Maynard	A	609	Yes
			Pocahontas	NCA	1590	Yes
			Oak Ridge	B	278	Yes

TABLE 2
(continued)

County	Service Region	Distance Factor	School District	Classification	Size	Questionnaire Received
Sharp	II	Yes				
			Cave City	A	833	Yes
			Evening Shade	A	221	Yes
			Hardy	NCA	1067	Yes
			Poughkeepsie	B	127	Yes
			Williford	A	326	Yes
St. Francis	III	No				
			Forrest City	NCA	5054	Yes
			Hughes	NCA	1571	Yes
			Palestine	A	620	No
			Wheatley	A	409	Yes
Stone	IV	Yes				
			Fifty-Six	O	58	Yes
			Mountain View	A	905	Yes
			Rural Special	B	217	Yes
			Imboden	A	346	Yes
White	V	Yes				
			Bald Knob	NCA	1348	Yes
			Beebe	NCA	1381	Yes
			Bradford	A	625	Yes
			Central	A	378	Yes
			Griffithville	A	267	Yes
			Judsonia	A	588	Yes
			Kensett	A	453	Yes
			McRae	A	353	Yes
			Pangburn	A	450	Yes
			Rose Bud	A	463	Yes
			Searcy	NCA	2609	Yes
Woodruff	V	Yes				
			Augusta	NCA	1023	Yes
			Cotton Plant	NCA	457	Yes
			McCrory	NCA	850	Yes
TOTALS 22	I-27 II-28 III-12 IV-16 V-29 VI-9	I-No II-No III-No IV-Yes V-Yes VI-Yes	121	NCA-48 A-55 B-14 C-2 O-2	114,643	117-Yes 4-No

Department of Arkansas, Annual Statistical Report of the Public Schools of Arkansas. Little Rock, Arkansas: Department of Education, January, 1977.

TABLE 3

CERTIFIED SCHOOL PERSONNEL POSITIONS BY COUNTY IN
THE ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY SERVICE AREA, 1975-76

	County	Administrators	Teachers	Service Personnel	TOTAL
1.	Baxter	13	157.8	8.7	179.5
2.	Clay	16	213	10	239
3.	Craighead	46.57	571.39	33.6	651.56
4.	Crittenden	46.5	574.5	31	652
5.	Cross	14.8	240.97	14.33	270.1
6.	Fulton	6	74.8	2.5	83.3
7.	Greene	21.6	291.5	17.1	330.2
8.	Independence	24.5	257.5	12.2	294.2
9.	Izard	10	94	4	108
10.	Jackson	16	215	10.5	241.5
11.	Lawrence	18.5	179.6	13.5	211.6
12.	Lee	20	231	16	267
13.	Mississippi	62.7	761.8	49.5	874
14.	Monroe	15	189.5	12	216.5
15.	Phillips	39.6	469	27	535.6
16.	Poinsett	23.5	322.6	21.5	367.6
17.	Randolph	10.5	124.5	4.5	139.5
18.	Sharp	10	130	5	145
19.	St. Francis	40	359.8	16.3	416.1
20.	Stone	7.5	81.5	4.5	93.5
21.	White	37.65	426	19.4	483.05
22.	Woodruff	10	145	12.5	167.5
TOTAL		509.92	6110.76	345.63	6966.31

Department of Arkansas, Annual Statistical Report of the Public Schools of Arkansas, Little Rock, Arkansas: Department of Education, January, 1977.

Descriptive Factors

Each school district was categorized on the basis of four factors. On the basis of classification each school was identified as being North Central Association (NCA) accredited or A, B, C or O. On size (number of students enrolled) each school district was placed into one of five categories (0-499, 500-999, 1000-1499, 1500-1999, 2000 or more). For this study the basic service area was divided into six homogeneous regions (I, II, III, IV, V, VI) where the first three do not represent a distance factor from the ASU Jonesboro campus, the remaining three do represent, on the average, a significantly greater distance factor.

Procedures

Assessing Needs

Questionnaire responses simply tabulated for each item would identify if particular needs did exist in that area. Representing these tabulations as percentages yields a better index for comparison, since respondents typically omit some items thus producing a varying number of total responses to items throughout the instrument.

By scaling the need categories as no need versus need (0-1), a total overall need by factors can be assessed. Between group significant differences perceived in overall need will be identified by statistically testing the classification, size, and region factors with the analysis of variance (ANOVA) technique. The two group distance factor will be tested with the t-test. Appropriate measures of association will show the practical significance of any observed significant differences.

Results

Of the 121 questionnaires mailed, 117 (97 percent) were completed and returned. The responses to these questionnaires constitute the data for this investigation.

Needs Assessment

The tabulations and percentages of perceived need for outside services are presented in Table 4. Based on the aforementioned 0-1-2 scale, the 20 topic areas are subsequently ranked on perceived need. Note (item 8) evaluation of instruction, (14) needs assessment and evaluation procedures, and (7) design and evaluation of federal programs (grant writing) are the highest ranked perceived areas of need for outside services. Note also that (20) transportation (routing, maintenance) and (5) course scheduling were identified as the areas in which the needs for outside services were the least. In 18 of the 20 topic areas more than 50 percent of the respondents indicated a need for outside services. Ninety-three percent of those responding indicated a need for outside services in school law (rights, responsibilities), and 91 percent in evaluation of instruction. On the other hand, 47 percent of those responding noted a need for outside services in transportation (routing, maintenance) and 50 percent in course scheduling.

When totaled over the 20 topic areas, 75 percent of the responses indicated need. (See Table 4). These overall needs were tested statistically by factor (group membership); that information is summarized in Table 5, p. 15. This analysis represents the totals of each respondent's identification of needs; the number of times the respondent indicated a need for outside

TABLE 4

SCHOOL SERVICES NEEDS ASSESSMENT RESULTS:
NEED OF OUTSIDE SERVICES

Item Number	Rank on Needs	Topic		Outside Services: No Need	Some Need	Much Need
1	16	Achievement testing	No.	37	66	9
			Pct.	(33)	(59)	(8)
2	13	Assessment and improvement of school rating	No.	32	70	11
			Pct.	(28)	(62)	(10)
3	6	Attitude of justment techniques	No.	16	74	24
			Pct.	(14)	(65)	(21)
4	10	Classroom management (discipline, environment)	No.	33	61	22
			Pct.	(28)	(53)	(19)
5	19	Course scheduling	No.	58	49	8
			Pct.	(50)	(43)	(7)
6	9	Curriculum design (overall, specific courses)	No.	17	82	15
			Pct.	(15)	(72)	(13)
7	3	Design and evaluation of federal programs (grant writing)	No.	19	56	41
			Pct.	(17)	(48)	(35)
8	1	Evaluation of instruction	No.	10	66	39
			Pct.	(9)	(57)	(34)
9	17	Extra-curricular alternatives (implementation)	No.	38	65	9
			Pct.	(34)	(58)	(8)
10	12	Facilities planning (additions, renovations)	No.	30	68	15
			Pct.	(27)	(60)	(13)
11	15	Finance, budget, business management	No.	37	64	12
			Pct.	(33)	(57)	(10)
12	18	Instructional Materials (purchase, use)	No.	43	66	5
			Pct.	(38)	(58)	(4)

TABLE 4
(continued)

Item Number	Rank on Needs	Topic		Outside Services: No Need	Some Need	Much Need
13	14	Management of personnel (certified, non-certified)	No.	33	73	8
			Pct.	(29)	(64)	(7)
14	2	Needs assessment and evaluation procedures	No.	12	69	34
			Pct.	(10)	(60)	(30)
15	11	New school board member orientation	No.	33	61	21
			Pct.	(20)	(53)	(18)
16	8	School-community public relations techniques (e.g., school bond issues)	No.	17	78	20
			Pct.	(15)	(68)	(17)
17	4	School law (rights, responsibilities)	No.	8	79	29
			Pct.	(7)	(68)	(25)
18	5	Special education (diagnosis, implementation)	No.	21	54	41
			Pct.	(18)	(47)	(35)
19	7	Student career awareness	No.	17	76	20
			Pct.	(15)	(67)	(18)
20	20	Transportation (routing, maintenance)	No.	60	46	7
			Pct.	(53)	(41)	(6)
		OVERALL	No.	571	1323	390
			Pct.	(25)	(58)	(17)

TABLE 5

SCHOOL SERVICES NEEDS ASSESSMENT RESULTS:
OVERALL NEEDS BY FACTOR

Factor	Groups	Test	Statistic	Probability*
Classification	(NCA, A, B or C or O)	ANOVA	F = .090	.907
Size	(0-499, 500-999, 1000-1999, 2000+)	ANOVA	F = .168	.915
Region	(I, II, III, IV, V, VI)	ANOVA	F = 1.346	.250
Distance	(near, far)	t-test	t = 1.18	.241

*Note no statistical tests were found significant at $\alpha = .05$.

services over the 20 topic areas. No significant differences were noted at $\alpha = .05$ for the three hypothesis tested by analysis of variance (ANOVA) nor for the one tested by the t-test. Thus, overall no significant differences were noted on the identification of the need for outside services between groups of school districts when categorized on the basis of accreditation classification, size of enrollment, region or distance from ASU.

Based on the 0-1-2 scale, the need of services was analyzed by factor by each topic. Although groups overall demonstrated needs in each of the 20 topic areas, some significant differences between groups were found for some items within the four factors.

School Classification. The assessment and improvement of school rating (item 2) was perceived as a greater need by school districts with less than North Central Association (NCA) accreditation. See Table 6. However, this perceived need was reversed in classroom management (4) and management of personnel (13) where school districts with NCA accreditation demonstrated a greater need. A greater need for outside services in the area of attitude adjustment techniques (3) was noted in the NCA school districts than in those rated B, C or O. The NCA accredited school districts also demonstrated more need for outside services in the areas of curriculum design (6) and extra-curricular alternatives (9) than did school districts with the A rating. School districts with the A rating, however, exhibited less need for outside services in the area of student career awareness (19) than did the NCA or B, C and O school districts.

TABLE 6

SCHOOL SERVICES NEEDS ASSESSMENT RESULTS:
NEEDS VERSUS CLASSIFICATION

Item	C1(NCA) $\bar{X}$	s	N	C2(A) $\bar{X}$	s	N	C3(B, C or O) $\bar{X}$	s	N	F-ratio	F-prob.	Significant Differences
1	.68	.59	47	.83	.60	48	.71	.59	17	.84	.438	
2	.59	.58	46	.94	.51	50	1.05	.66	17	6.59	.002*	C2,C3 - C1
3	1.22	.59	46	1.04	.56	51	.76	.56	17	3.97	.021*	C1 - C3
4	1.15	.66	47	.75	.65	52	.71	.69	17	5.42	.006*	C1 - C2,C3
5	.55	.62	47	.55	.58	51	.65	.79	17	.17	.843	
6	1.13	.45	47	.86	.50	50	.94	.75	17	3.25	.041*	C1 - C2
7	1.04	.72	47	1.23	.67	52	1.47	.62	17	2.59	.078	
8	1.36	.61	47	1.16	.54	51	1.24	.75	17	1.42	.244	
9	.96	.60	45	.56	.58	50	.71	.47	17	5.69	.005*	C1 - C2
10	.83	.73	47	.92	.53	49	.82	.53	17	.29	.752	
11	.87	.71	47	.69	.51	49	.76	.66	17	.99	.377	
12	.68	.59	47	.70	.54	50	.53	.51	17	.61	.549	
13	.98	.58	46	.65	.52	51	.65	.49	17	5.14	.007*	C1 - C2,C3
14	1.30	.66	46	1.10	.57	52	1.18	.53	17	1.46	.235	
15	.98	.75	46	.85	.61	52	.82	.73	17	.57	.574	
16	1.09	.65	47	1.02	.51	51	.88	.49	17	.80	.458	
17	1.23	.60	47	1.15	.46	52	1.12	.60	17	.41	.671	
18	1.15	.73	46	1.17	.67	53	1.24	.83	17	.08	.912	
19	.91	.62	46	1.20	.53	50	.82	.39	17	4.51	.013*	C2 - C1,C3
20	.49	.59	45	.53	.61	51	.65	.70	17	.41	.673	

*$p < .05$

Number of Students Enrolled. School district size based on the number of students enrolled yielded several significant differences between larger and smaller school districts in perceived needs of outside services. However, in 15 of the 20 topic areas no significant differences on the basis of school district size were noted in need for outside services as shown in Table 7. Generally, a greater need for outside services was demonstrated by smaller school districts in the areas of assessment and improvement of school rating (item 2) and design and evaluation of federal programs (7). Larger school districts indicated a significantly greater need in the areas of classroom management (4) and extra-curricular alternatives (9). In the management of personnel (13) a greater need for outside services was noted for school districts in the 1000-1999 range than those with less than 500 students. Generally, little overall differentiations on need for outside services was found on the basis of school district size.

Region. Only one significant difference was noted in comparing the perceived needs of outside services by item throughout the six regions in the ASU service area. See Table 8, p. 20. Region VI demonstrated a greater need for outside services in the area of extra-curricular alternatives (item 9) did either Region II or IV.

Distance. When comparing service needs by distance from the ASU Jonesboro campus, two significant differences were observed in Table 9, p. 21. School districts further from ASU identified a greater need for outside service in the design and evaluation of federal programs (item 7). School districts closer to ASU indicated a significantly greater need for outside services in the area of needs assessment and evaluation procedures (14).

TABLE 7

SCHOOL SERVICES NEEDS ASSESSMENT RESULTS:
NEEDS VERSUS SCHOOL SIZE

Item	S1(0-499) $\bar{X}$	s	N	S2(500-999) $\bar{X}$	s	N	S3(1000-1999) $\bar{X}$	s	N	S4(2000 or more) $\bar{X}$	s	N	F-ratio	F-Prob.	Significant Differences
1.	.88	.55	51	.59	.57	27	.67	.64	24	.70	.67	10	1.70	.171	
2.	.98	.58	52	.75	.52	28	.65	.65	23	.50	.53	10	3.18	.027*	S1 - S3,S4
3.	.96	.59	53	1.07	.60	28	1.21	.51	24	1.33	.71	9	1.65	.180	
4.	.72	.66	53	.93	.65	29	1.13	.74	24	1.30	.48	10	3.49	.018*	S3,S4 - S1
5.	.58	.67	52	.62	.56	29	.58	.65	24	.30	.48	10	.69	.565	
6.	.87	.59	53	1.00	.48	27	1.13	.45	24	1.20	.42	10	2.01	.115	
7.	1.37	.63	52	.93	.69	30	1.25	.68	24	.90	.88	10	3.28	.024*	S1 - S2,S4
8.	1.13	.60	52	1.34	.61	29	1.42	.58	24	1.20	.63	10	1.52	.212	
9.	.55	.58	51	.90	.62	29	.95	.49	22	.80	.63	10	3.63	.015*	S2,S3 - S1
10.	.90	.57	51	.86	.59	28	.83	.70	24	.80	.79	10	.12	.946	
11.	.73	.53	51	.75	.70	28	.92	.65	24	.80	.79	10	.53	.664	
12.	.62	.53	52	.75	.59	28	.67	.64	24	.70	.48	10	.36	.786	
13.	.65	.52	51	.80	.61	30	1.09	.51	23	.70	.48	10	3.56	.017*	S3 - S1
14.	1.13	.56	53	1.14	.69	29	1.35	.57	23	1.30	.68	10	.86	.466	
15.	.81	.66	52	1.07	.64	30	1.00	.78	24	.56	.53	9	1.90	.131	
16.	.92	.52	51	1.13	.51	30	1.08	.65	24	1.10	.74	10	1.07	.367	
17.	1.13	.49	52	1.23	.68	30	1.33	.48	24	.90	.32	10	1.82	.146	
18.	1.15	.74	53	1.23	.68	30	1.30	.70	23	.80	.63	10	1.27	.288	
19.	1.08	.52	52	1.07	.66	28	1.00	.52	23	.70	.67	10	1.30	.279	
20.	.56	.67	52	.48	.51	29	.59	.67	22	.40	.52	10	.31	.821	

*Γ < .05

TABLE 8

SCHOOL SERVICES NEEDS ASSESSMENT RESULTS:
NEEDS VERSUS REGION

Item No.	I			II			III			IV			V			VI			F-ratio	F-prob.	Significant Differences
	$\bar{X}$	s	N	$\bar{X}$	s	N	$\bar{X}$	s	N	$\bar{X}$	s	N	$\bar{X}$	s	N	$\bar{X}$	s	N			
1	.80	.58	25	.63	.74	27	.73	.47	11	.85	.69	13	.82	.39	28	.63	.74	8	.47	.799	
2	.64	.57	25	.74	.59	27	.91	.70	11	1.00	.39	14	.89	.63	28	.88	.64	8	.97	.443	
3	1.19	.63	26	.96	.59	27	1.09	.54	11	.79	.58	14	1.14	.52	29	1.29	.76	7	1.33	.255	
4	1.00	.63	26	.79	.74	28	1.27	.79	11	.93	.47	14	.69	.71	29	1.25	.46	8	1.97	.089	
5	.52	.59	25	.54	.69	28	.55	.69	11	.64	.63	14	.52	.57	29	.88	.64	8	.50	.775	
6	.96	.45	26	.93	.68	27	1.27	.47	11	.93	.62	14	.89	.42	28	1.25	.46	8	1.34	.254	
7	1.16	.75	25	1.11	.79	28	.73	.47	11	1.40	.63	15	1.38	.56	29	1.13	.83	8	1.84	.110	
8	1.35	.63	26	1.22	.70	27	1.27	.65	11	1.20	.56	15	1.18	.55	28	1.38	.52	8	.30	.910	
9	.67	.56	24	.61	.57	28	1.09	.54	11	.50	.52	14	.78	.64	27	1.25	.46	8	3.01	.014*	VI - II,IV
10	.96	.68	25	.70	.61	27	.64	.67	11	1.07	.62	14	.89	.57	28	1.00	.53	8	1.19	.318	
11	.84	.69	25	.67	.55	27	.82	.75	11	.71	.61	14	.79	.63	28	1.00	.53	8	.45	.812	
12	.77	.59	26	.48	.64	27	.73	.47	11	.57	.51	14	.68	.48	28	1.00	.53	8	1.48	.203	
13	.83	.48	24	.75	.59	28	.82	.40	11	.60	.51	15	.75	.65	28	1.13	.64	8	1.00	.422	
14	1.35	.69	26	1.14	.65	28	1.55	.52	11	.93	.47	14	1.18	.48	28	.88	.64	8	2.21	.058	
15	1.00	.72	24	.79	.79	28	.91	.54	11	.67	.49	15	.97	.63	29	1.13	.83	8	.84	.528	
16	1.12	.60	25	.93	.60	28	1.18	.75	11	.80	.41	15	1.04	.51	28	1.25	.46	8	1.20	.314	
17	1.16	.62	25	1.18	.55	28	1.36	.50	11	1.00	.38	15	1.14	.44	29	1.50	.76	8	1.22	.307	
18	1.35	.75	26	1.11	.74	28	1.18	.60	11	1.07	.70	15	1.11	.74	28	1.25	.71	8	.48	.795	
19	.88	.52	26	1.00	.68	27	1.09	.70	11	1.07	.27	14	1.07	.47	27	1.25	.89	8	.64	.670	
20	.63	.58	24	.57	.74	28	.27	.47	11	.36	.50	14	.57	.63	28	.63	.52	8	.81	.549	

$p < .05$

TABLE 9

SCHOOL SERVICES NEEDS ASSESSMENT RESULTS:
NEEDS VERSUS DISTANCE FROM ASU

Item	Near			Far			t-value	Two-tail Prob.
	$\bar{X}$	s	N	$\bar{X}$	s	N		
1	.71	.63	63	.80	.54	49	-.74	.463
2	.73	.60	63	.92	.57	50	-1.72	.088
3	1.08	.60	64	1.06	.59	50	.16	.871
4	.95	.72	65	.84	.64	51	.87	.384
5	.53	.64	64	.61	.60	51	-.66	.512
6	1.00	.56	64	.96	.49	50	.40	.687
7	1.06	.73	64	1.35	.62	52	-2.25	.026*
8	1.28	.65	64	1.22	.54	51	.59	.557
9	.71	.58	63	.78	.62	49	-.53	.596
10	.79	.65	63	.96	.57	50	-1.45	.151
11	.76	.64	63	.80	.61	50	-.32	.747
12	.64	.60	64	.70	.51	50	-.57	.568
13	.79	.51	63	.76	.62	51	.27	.790
14	1.29	.66	65	1.06	.51	50	2.14	.035*
15	.89	.72	63	.90	.63	52	-.12	.906
16	1.05	.63	64	1.00	.49	51	.45	.654
17	1.20	.57	64	1.15	.50	52	.50	.621
18	1.22	.72	65	1.12	.71	51	.73	.466
19	.97	.62	64	1.10	.51	49	-1.26	.211
20	.54	.64	63	.52	.58	50	.17	.865

*p < .05

Types of Services Desired

For the 20 topics the tabulations and percentages of the types of outside services preferred are presented in Table 10. The desired types vary by topic, but overall the categories culminating in formal college credit course work were the least preferred. Eighty-two percent of the total responses favored workshop activities and consultants rather than formal courses.

A subsequent investigation involved totaling the types of services desired over all items to contrast the total responses with the four descriptive factors (classification, school size, region and distance). Table 11, p. 25, shows that overall preference of types of outside services is independent of only the distance factor. Thus, the groupings under each of the other factors (classification, size and region) are somewhat consistent within groupings of their total preference for these five types of outside services (workshop, inservice, consultants, on-campus course, and off-campus course.) The contingency coefficient as a measure of association shows little practical relationship between overall type of outside service preferred and school classification (.096), school size (.107), and region (.143).

An investigation of the type of outside services preferred contrasted with the four factors for each item preduced situations in which the chi-square coefficient was inappropriate due to the size of the sample. To make a valid interpretations of the results by topic area, categories of the types of services were collapsed to produce three categories identified as groupwork (workshops and inservice), consultant(s) and course work (at ASU and in the district). These results are presented in Table 12, p. 26. In 80 chi-square tests, however, note only two significant results.

TABLE 10

SCHOOL SERVICES NEEDS ASSESSMENT RESULTS:
TYPES OF SERVICES DESIRED

Topic		Type of Service: Workshop, at ASU	Inservice, in district	Consultant(s)	Course, at ASU	Course, in district
1. Achievement testing	No.	24	30	26	6	4
	Pct.	(27)	(33)	(29)	(7)	(4)
2. Assessment and improvement of school rating	No.	16	27	43	2	
	Pct.	(18)	(31)	(49)	(2)	
3. Attitude adjustment techniques	No.	24	50	10	10	7
	Pct.	(24)	(49)	(10)	(10)	(7)
4. Classroom management (discipline, environment)	No.	26	49	2	10	10
	Pct.	(27)	(51)	(2)	(10)	(10)
5. Course scheduling	No.	19	16	31	9	3
	Pct.	(24)	(20)	(40)	(12)	(4)
6. Curriculum design (overall, specific courses)	No.	21	15	33	21	6
	Pct.	(21)	(15)	(32)	(26)	(6)
7. Design and evaluation of federal programs (grant writing)	No.	29	8	42	16	2
	Pct.	(30)	(8)	(43)	(17)	(2)
8. Evaluation of instruction	No.	25	30	33	15	3
	Pct.	(24)	(28)	(31)	(14)	(3)
9. Extra-curricular activities (implementation)	No.	25	17	31	9	5
	Pct.	(29)	(19)	(36)	(10)	(6)
10. Facilities planning (additions, renovations)	No.	10	8	62	13	1
	Pct.	(11)	(8)	(66)	(14)	(1)
11. Finance, budget, business management	No.	28	5	37	18	3
	Pct.	(31)	(5)	(41)	(20)	(3)

TABLE 10
(continued)

Topic		Type of Service: Workshop, at ASU	Inservice, in district	Consultant(s)	Course, at ASU	Course, in district
12. Instructional materials (purchase, use)	No.	26	22	24	9	3
	Pct.	(31)	(26)	(28)	(11)	(4)
13. Management of personnel (certified, noncertified)	No.	29	16	22	20	3
	Pct.	(32)	(18)	(25)	(22)	(3)
14. Needs assessment and evaluation procedures	No.	24	19	37	19	3
	Pct.	(23)	(19)	(36)	(19)	(3)
15. New school board member orientation	No.	43	25	17	2	2
	Pct.	(49)	(28)	(19)	(2)	(2)
16. School-community public relations techniques (e.g., school bond issues	No.	29	24	29	11	6
	Pct.	(29)	(24)	(29)	(11)	(6)
17. School law (rights, responsibilities)	No.	33	19	18	29	7
	Pct.	(31)	(18)	(17)	(27)	(7)
18. Special education (diagnosis, implementation)	No.	25	26	34	9	7
	Pct.	(25)	(26)	(33)	(9)	(7)
19. Student career awareness	No.	18	55	20	13	15
	Pct.	(18)	(54)	(20)	(13)	(15)
20. Transportation (routing, maintenance)	No.	21	19	26	8	2
	Pct.	(28)	(25)	(34)	(10)	(3)
OVERALL	No.	495	460	577	254	74
	Pct.	(26)	(25)	(31)	(14)	(4)

TABLE 11

SCHOOL SERVICES NEEDS ASSESSMENT RESULTS:
OVERALL TYPE OF SERVICES PREFERRED BY FACTOR

Factor	Groups	Degrees of Freedom	χ^2 Test Statistic	Probability
Classification	(NCA, A, B, C or O)	8	17.64	.03*
Size	(0-499, 500-999, 1000-1999, 2000+)	12	21.87	.04*
Region	(I, II, III, IV, V, VI)	20	39.43	.01*
Distance	(near, far)	4	6.24	.19

*$p < .05$.

TABLE 12

SCHOOL SERVICES NEEDS ASSESSMENT RESULTS:
PREFERENCE OF OUTSIDE SERVICES BY FACTOR

Item Number	Number of Responses	Classification		No. of Students		Region		Distance	
		χ^2(4df)	Prob.	χ^2(6df)	Prob.	χ^2(4df)	Prob.	χ^2(2df)	Prob.
1	90	2.35	.671	9.48	.148	6.19	.185	.38	.826
2	88	5.37	.252	3.23	.779	10.92	.028*	3.77	.152
3	101	1.00	.910	3.11	.795	3.17	.530	.90	.638
4	97	2.48	.648	4.86	.562	2.70	.609	4.00	.135
5	78	4.65	.325	5.48	.484	5.55	.235	1.12	.572
6	101	4.29	.368	5.99	.425	1.03	.906	.74	.691
7	97	2.72	.607	2.99	.811	2.76	.599	4.43	.109
8	106	2.56	.634	5.36	.499	4.12	.390	7.15	.028*
9	87	4.20	.380	10.00	.125	2.75	.601	2.93	.231
10	94	3.80	.434	2.97	.813	1.81	.771	4.67	.097
11	91	5.53	.237	6.10	.413	1.41	.843	.29	.865
12	84	1.81	.771	3.94	.685	2.65	.617	.54	.765
13	90	1.18	.882	4.33	.633	.78	.942	.99	.610
14	102	1.53	.821	6.14	.407	2.93	.570	4.15	.126
15	89	2.00	.736	1.00	.986	2.79	.593	1.46	.482
16	99	.26	.993	8.23	.222	2.16	.707	.09	.956
17	106	3.23	.520	5.92	.433	9.45	.051	1.26	.534
18	101	3.14	.535	6.51	.369	.59	.964	1.36	.506
19	101	.55	.968	10.63	.101	.97	.914	.54	.765
20	76	1.06	.900	5.45	.487	.54	.970	.25	.881

*p <.05

Classification. To appropriately use the chi-square statistic, three categories of this factor were utilized in the analysis (NCA, A and B, C or O). Note no significant chi-square coefficients. Thus, under these categories, school districts do not appear to select type of outside services based upon this categorization and classification.

Size. Four size categories were used in this analysis (0-499, 500-999, 1000-1999, 2000 or more). Note again no significant chi-square coeffients. It appears that school districts do not have particular preferences based on size with respect to the aforementioned three-category types of outside services.

Region. To meet the assumptions for using chi-square, regions were grouped as northwest (II and IV), middle (I and V), and southeast (III and VI). A significant chi-square was noted in analyzing item two. An investigation of the data revealed that no district selected coursework categories, thus the chi-square coefficient reported is inappropriate since two cells have expected frequencies of zero. Over topic areas, school districts did not select types of outside services based upon the particular area (northwest, middle or southwest) of the ASU service area they represented.

Distance. A single significant chi-square coefficient was noted in evaluating item eight by the distance factor. School districts near ASU tend to favor workshop or inservice activities (the groupwork category) as an outside service to meet their needs in evaluation of instruction (item 8). Schools farther away from ASU indicated their preference more strongly toward consultants on this matter. Other than this topic area, distance was not a factor in selecting a type of outside service under this subgrouping.

Conclusions

The responses to the school services needs assessment questionnaire indicates the need of outside services by school districts in the Arkansas State University service area. Also, it might be inferred that the 97 percent response rate reveals an overall confidence in Arkansas State University concerning the identification and servicing of these needs.

Needs Assessment

The primary focus of this investigation was to determine if school districts in the Arkansas State University service area felt the need of outside services in coping with selected educational problems. Results of this study indicate a significant need for outside services. Between 47 and 93 percent of the respondents identified a need for outside services in each of the 20 topic areas presented.

The responses to the questionnaire were categorized on four factors (classification, school size, region, and distance from ASU) to determine if school districts exhibiting certain characteristics had service needs different from districts exhibiting other characteristics. Since the responses produced such a demonstration of needs for outside services, there was little differentiation by any characteristic in the depiction of variations of perceived service needs.

These areas where the need for outside services were the greatest require basic measurement skills. Note the 1-2-3 ranking of evaluation of instruction, needs assessment and evaluation procedures, and design and evaluation of federal programs. These demonstrated needs might be due in

part to the current push toward accountability measures in the nation's schools and specifically to the passage of accountability type legislation recently in Arkansas.

Types of Outside Services Preferred

The majority of the superintendents responding to the school services needs assessment questionnaire indicated a preference for non-credit type services in meeting the various needs. Thus, their interest was specific in meeting the need and they were not generally interested in accumulating hours of college credit. Primary interest was in consultants, workshop and inservice activities.

In several topic areas the type of outside service desired was a course at ASU. However, these courses namely school law and curriculum design, are currently offered several times throughout the year. This represents both a lack of communication with some school district administrators concerning curricular offerings at ASU, and the satisfaction of other school administrators with these courses in meeting their need for outside services in these areas.

In general, there was little differentiation by school classification, size, region or distance from the ASU campus in types of outside services desired. Thus, the same type of service would generally be appropriate for all school districts in the service area in meeting a particular need.

Recommendations

This investigation was intended basically to assess if there existed a need for outside services in the Arkansas State University service area. The need does exist. Topics presented in the questionnaire were general in nature, certainly not exhaustive of the problems in which outside services would be desired. Nor were the problem areas rated or ranked as to their urgency by persons completing and returning the questionnaire. Thus, an on-site in depth evaluation is essential to further establish the specific problems of most concern and the specific help most desired by the school districts located within the ASU service area.

An on-site evaluation should also focus on the type of outside services desired to meet these specific needs. The role of the school district and Arkansas State University should be discussed to establish the groundwork for coordinating additional efforts in meeting the needs of providing an ever increasing quality of education.

School district administrators have indicated a desire to cooperate with Arkansas State University (1) in the identification of educational needs and (2) in implementing solutions for their potential resolution. Arkansas State University has the opportunity to take the leadership role in coordinating desired services (such as workshops, inservice training, consultants and courses) in meeting the educational needs of this basic service area.

APPENDIX

ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION,
DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL
ADMINISTRATION AND
SECONDARY EDUCATION

STATE UNIVERSITY,
ARKANSAS 72467

AUGUST 3, 1977

MR. I. M. HEAD, SUPERINTENDENT
TOPKNOTCH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
TOPKNOTCH, AR 72000

DEAR MR. HEAD:

THERE ARE MANY AREAS OF CONCERN THAT AN ADMINISTRATOR MUST FACE WITH LITTLE OR NO OUTSIDE INTERACTION. EVEN IF DESIRED, SERVICES IN PROBLEM AREAS ARE SOMETIMES UNAVAILABLE OR VERY DIFFICULT TO OBTAIN.

IN AN EFFORT TO DETERMINE IF A NEED DOES EXIST FOR OUTSIDE SERVICES IN PROBLEM AREAS, THE ENCLOSED QUESTIONNAIRE IS BEING SENT TO SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS IN THE ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY SERVICE AREA. YOUR COOPERATION IS SINCERELY REQUESTED IN IDENTIFYING POSSIBLE NEEDS AND DESIRABLE FORMATS TO MEET SUCH NEEDS.

PLEASE COMPLETE THE QUESTIONNAIRE FOLLOWING THE TWO-STEP DIRECTIONS AT THE TOP OF THE PAGE, AND RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE PRE-ADDRESSED, STAMPED ENVELOPE THAT IS ENCLOSED.

SINCERELY,

M. Vance Sales

M. VANCE SALES, CHAIRMAN

ENCLOSURES

SCHOOL SERVICES NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Directions: Please follow these two steps in responding to this questionnaire.

First, consider each of the following topics with respect to existing or potential outside help for your district. Check one of the three categories on the left for each topic, indicating your district's need for outside services in that area.

Secondly, whether or not there is a need, go through the topics a second time and circle one of the five types of services on the right which you believe would best serve a district's needs on that topic.

OUTSIDE SERVICES				Type of Service				
No Need	Some Need	Much Need	TOPICS	Workshop, at ASU	Inservice, in district	Consultant(s)	Course, at ASU	Course, in district
				1	2	3	4	5
			1. Achievement testing					
			2. Assessment and improvement of school rating					
			3. Attitude adjustment techniques					
			4. Classroom management (discipline, environment)					
			5. Course scheduling					
			6. Curriculum design (overall, specific courses)					
			7. Design and evaluation of federal programs (grant writing)					
			8. Evaluation of instruction					
			9. Extra-curricular alternatives (implementation)					
			10. Facilities planning (additions, renovations)					
			11. Finance, budget, business management					
			12. Instructional materials (purchase, use)					
			13. Management of personnel (certified, noncertified)					
			14. Needs assessment and evaluation procedures					
			15. New school board member orientation					
			16. School-community public relations techniques (e.g., school bond issues)					
			17. School law (rights, responsibilities)					
			18. Special education (diagnosis, implementation)					
			19. Student career awareness					
			20. Transportation (routing, maintenance)					
			21. Other _____					
			22. Other _____					